



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/785,872 | 02/16/2001 | Rocky Stewart | BEAS-01033US4 | 6323 |

23910 7590 05/19/2004

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,872

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application Number 9/785, 872 was filed on 02/16/2001. Claims 1-22 are subject to examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 2, 3, 4, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 13 and 14 recite the collaboration hub wherein additional components may be plugged into the collaboration hub, wherein the plugged components of claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 are plugged between the hub and the hub transport layer. This clearly indicates that there are two discrete hubs, one being the collaboration hub and the other being the hub. It is unclear what the intended metes and bounds of these claims are. For the purpose of this office action, the hub is treated as being it represents the conglomerated internal components of the collaboration hub.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cloud et al. (hereinafter Cloud) (US 5, 634, 127).

Referring to claim 1,

The reference Cloud teaches a collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system (Fig.4), comprising:

a hub transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to participants; (Fig. 4, element 410, Fig.6, element 610, Fig.7, element 720, col. 3, lines 59-64, col. 7, lines 40-44)

a hub router for routing messages from a first participant to a second participant; (Fig.4, element 421, Fig.7, element 730, col.3, lines 64-67, col.7, lines 51-57)

a hub scheduler for scheduling the flow of messages between the hub router and the hub transport; (Fig.7, element 725, col.4, lines 34-39, col. 10, lines 39-40).

a conversation manager for managing the flow of messages between participants; and, (Fig.4, element 450 (Message Driven Processor), col. 3, lines 59-67)

a repository for storing conversation management data. (col. 4, lines 17-21).

Referring to claim 2,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub of claim 1 wherein additional components may be plugged into the collaboration hub. (Figs.4, 6 and 7, col. 3, lines 14-55)

Referring to claims 3 and 4,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub of claim 2 wherein said additional component is a decoder for decoding messages between the hub transport layer and the hub and wherein said additional component is an encoder for encoding messages between the hub and the hub transport layer. (Col.7, lines 47-51).

Referring to claim 5,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub wherein said additional component is a messaging router for routing between participants. (col.4, lines 41-54).

Referring to claim 6,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub wherein said additional component is a messaging filter for filtering message to and from a participant. (col.58-63).

Referring to claim 7,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub wherein said additional component is a messaging logic plugin for intelligent routing and filtering of messages to and from participants. (col. 5, lines 20-31)

Referring to claim 11,

Claim 11 is a claim to a method carried out by the collaboration system of claim 1.
Therefore, claim 11 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 12,

Claim 12 is a claim to a method carried out by the collaboration system of claim 2.
Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

Referring to claims 13 and 14,

Claims 13 and 14 are claims to methods carried out by the collaboration system of claims 3 and 4. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 3 and 4.

Referring to claim 15,

Claim 15 is a claim to a method carried out by the collaboration system of claim 5.

Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

Referring to claim 16,

Claim 16 is a claim to a method carried out by the collaboration system of claim 6.

Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

Referring to claim 17,

Claim 17 is a claim to a method carried out by the collaboration system of claim 7.

Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7.

Referring to claim 21,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system (Fig. 4), comprising:

a hub transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to participants; (Fig. 4, element 410, Fig.6, element 610, Fig.7, element 720, col. 3, lines 59-64, col. 7, lines 40-44)

a hub router for routing messages from a first participant to a second participant; and (Fig.4, element 421, Fig.7, element 730, col.3, lines 64-67, col.7, lines 51-57)

a hub scheduler for scheduling the flow of messages between the hub router and the hub transport. (Fig.7, element 725, col.4, lines 34-39, col. 10, lines 39-40).

Referring to claim 22,

The reference teaches a method for transferring messages between participants in a collaboration system (Fig.4), comprising the steps of:

receiving messages via a hub transport from a first participants and sending messages to a second participant; (Fig. 4, element 410, Fig.6, element 610, Fig.7, element 720, col. 3, lines 59-64, col. 7, lines 40-44)

routing messages via a hub router from a first participant to a second participant; and (Fig.4, element 421, Fig.7, element 730, col.3, lines 64-67, col.7, lines 51-57)

scheduling the flow of messages between the hub router and the hub transport. (Fig.7, element 725, col.4, lines 34-39, col. 10, lines 39-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloud et al. (hereinafter Cloud) (US 5, 634, 127) in view of Perkowski (US 6, 625, 581).

Referring to claims 8, 9 and 10,

The reference Cloud teaches that the message driven processor has a number of network ports, 710, each of which services a corresponding network. Each network is characterized by a communications protocol which specified how stations on the network interact. Protocols LU6.2, LU0 and LU2 are protocols generally utilized in an IBM environment. CICS stands for Customer Information Control System which is an

Art Unit: 2154

IBM product permitting access to application programs associated with it, formatting information in a manner analogous to a formal protocol. (col.12, lines 36-45). (component is a business logic plugin for integrating with a business logic used by the participant.) The reference also teaches "Protocol independence between the back-end host and the message driven processor is achieved by server agents. The server process responds by providing reply information to the message driven processor where it is assembled, with optional other reply information into one or more reply messages which is sent to the client. Message based connectivity between one or more client processes and said message driven processor is made protocol transparent to the user by providing client agents which handle differences in network protocol. (col.4, lines 1-10). The reference also teaches that the server agents and client agents can accommodate additional protocols (additional component is a business logic plugin for integrating with a business logic used by the participant business logic plugins). (Fig. 6, element "other"). The reference fails to teach business logic plugin is a RosettaNet plugin and wherein said RosettaNet plugin allows the sending of messages from one RosettaNet client to another. The reference Perkowski teaches the method and system for delivering consumer product related information (participant) to consumers (participants) over the internet. (Abstract). The most valuable teachings of the reference is that manufacturers (i.e. vendors) can format their data transactions in any of the many new languages of electronic-business (e.g. cXML, RosettaNet, CBL, BizTalk, OBI, ICE proprietary formats, or standard EDI formats such as ANSI X12), and the CenterStage 4 platform will automatically convert their transactions into the chosen

Art Unit: 2154

formats of the system administrator responsible for managing the master UPN/URL database. (col.84, lines 12-19). Thus, the reference teaches that RosettaNet can be automatically converted into the chosen format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add RosettaNet to the MDP of Cloud as server agent and client agent such that messaging between two Rosettanet clients is possible. And, also the Protocol independence between the back-end host and the message driven processor is achieved by server agents. The server process responds by providing reply information to the message driven processor where it is assembled, with optional other reply information into one or more reply messages which is sent to the client. Message based connectivity between one or more client processes and message driven processor is made protocol transparent to the user by providing client agents which handle differences in network protocol as taught by Cloud.

Referring to claims 18, 19 and 20,

Claims 18, 19 and 20 are claims to methods carried out by the collaboration system of claims 8, 9 and 10. Therefore, claims 18, 19 and 20 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 8, 9 and 10.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (703) 305-2655. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100